



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,422	10/01/2003	David M. Hilbert	CQ10212	5644
23493	7590	11/29/2008		
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
SAEED, USMAAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2166				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/20/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@sughrue.com

USPatDocketing@sughrue.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,422

Applicant(s)

HILBERT ET AL.

Examiner

USMAAN SAEED

Art Unit

2166

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-19, 22-24 and 26-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-19, 22-24 and 26-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 07/16/2008 is acknowledged.

Claims 22, 36, and 39 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 3-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 16-19, 22-24, 26, 28-29, 31-33, 34-37, and 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Benoit Julien**. (**Julien** hereinafter) (U.S. PG Pub No. 2002/0129011) in view of **Bell at al.** (**Bell** hereinafter)

(U.S. PG Pub 2004/0044785), further in view of **Rie Kubota**. (**Kubota** hereinafter) (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,323).

With respect to claim 36, **Julien** teaches **an information retrieval apparatus, comprising:**

“a database containing contact information” as (**Julien** Figure 1).

“an information monitoring device for monitoring a document on a computer display to proactively identify searchable text elements within the document” as the input 24 receives from the workstation 12 an input signal conveying at least one instruction governing the collection of the specific information. The instruction(s) may include the location where the collection is to take place, the nature of the specific information to be collected, a key word based on which the specific information is to be collected, among other possibilities (**Julien** Paragraphs 0030, 0008-0009, 0015, 0021, 0034, and 0042).

“an analyzer comparing each of the searchable text elements to the contact information in the database to identify potential contact information” as the system 20 collects business-related information, in particular sales lead information (also referred to herein as contact information) for potential clients, from the many pages of the WWW accessible via the Internet 16 (**Julien** Paragraph 0031).

“a data output device that notifies a user of contacts associated with the potential contact information without disrupting user’s current task on the computer and without disrupting display of said current document” as a system

user provides URL address(es) to the system 20 at workstation 12, in response to a prompt from the system 20, from which the contact information is to be collected. The system 20 thus receives at input 24 an input signal conveying the location, in the form of at least one URL address, where the collection of contact information is to take place, each Web page connected to the URL address(es) being a source of unstructured digitized data that potentially contains contact information. The output 26 releases an output signal conveying the collected contact information to the workstation 12, for display on a monitor to the system user (**Julien** Paragraph 0031).

Julien discloses the elements of claim 36 as noted above but does not explicitly disclose, **“monitoring a current document being viewed by a user on a display” and “an information analysis device that assigns a score to the identified potential contact information.”**

However, **Bell** teaches **“monitoring a current document being viewed by a user on a display”** as if the device user is viewing a restaurant's Web page, and if the device user has previously registered an address book application with hypertext extraction software residing on the user's device, the user can indicate or command, at the user's option, that a displayed restaurant address be stored in the user's address book application (**Bell** Paragraph 0023). Web browser window 100 can be made up of a number of frames. For example, one frame can be a browser menu 102 the details of which are not particularly relevant to embodiments of the present invention. Another frame (not shown) could be an advertisement. Another frame (not shown) could include contact information, such as a phone number, address, etc. Another frame (not shown)

could be a menu (separate from browser menu 102) that is associated with a Web page currently being displayed (**Bell Paragraph 0062**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Bell's** teaching would have allowed **Julien** to provide a mechanism for a device user to determine which of one or more applications running on the device can automatically store relevant information appearing on a Web page in the form of a hypertext element.

Julien and Bell disclose the elements of claim 36 as noted above but do not explicitly disclose, “**an information analysis device that assigns a score to the identified potential contact information.**”

However, **Kubota** discloses, “**an information analysis device that assigns a score to the identified potential information**” as ranking Search returns a list of documents in the order of the score, which is level of relevance to specified search condition (**Kubota Col 16, Lines 8-10**).

Kubota further discloses “**an information monitoring device that monitors a user's current document displayed on a computer display to identify searchable text elements within the document**” as a unique character string is extracted from an input document and a similarity search is performed by using the unique character string (**Kubota Abstract & Figure 11**). In figure 11, the document 907 is being displayed and similarity search could be clicked to find similar documents.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because

Kubota's teaching would have allowed **Julien and Bell** to provide a method for identifying a unique character string contained in an input document which is input into a computer system, said computer system being operable to search comparison documents stored in a storage medium.

Claims 22 and 39 are same as claim 36 and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 3, **Julien** teaches “**converting the document to a plurality of searchable representation elements and determining, for each searchable representation, if the searchable representation element is a contact-related portion**” as the input 24 receives from the workstation 12 an input signal conveying at least one instruction governing the collection of the specific information. The instruction(s) may include the location where the collection is to take place, the nature of the specific information to be collected, a key word based on which the specific information is to be collected, among other possibilities (**Julien** Paragraph 0030). The identification unit is then operative to examine the data contained in each Web page connected to the URL address and to identify therein any information elements relevant to contact information, such as a telephone number, an e-mail address, a postal code, a name of a city, etc (**Julien** Paragraph 0013).

With respect to claim 4, **Julien** teaches “**determining if the searchable representation element is the contact-related portion comprises determining if that searchable representation element is at least one of at least a postal code, an email address, a location on a network and a telephone number**” as the input 24 receives from the workstation 12 an input signal conveying at least one instruction governing the collection of the specific information. The instruction(s) may include the location where the collection is to take place, the nature of the specific information to be collected, a key word based on which the specific information is to be collected, among other possibilities (**Julien** Paragraph 0030). The identification unit is then operative to examine the data contained in each Web page connected to the URL address and to identify therein any information elements relevant to contact information, such as a telephone number, an e-mail address, a postal code, a name of a city, etc (**Julien** Paragraph 0013).

Claims 23 and 26 are essentially the same as claim 4 except they set forth the claimed invention as a system and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 5, **Julien** teaches “**comparing each identified portion of the plurality of searchable representation elements to information present in the database**” as the system 20 collects business-related information, in particular sales lead information (also referred to herein as contact information) for potential clients,

from the many pages of the WWW accessible via the Internet 16 (**Julien** Paragraph 0031).

“determining, for each identified portion, if the portion matches any information elements of the database” as a system user provides URL address(es) to the system 20 at workstation 12, in response to a prompt from the system 20, from which the contact information is to be collected. The system 20 thus receives at input 24 an input signal conveying the location, in the form of at least one URL address, where the collection of contact information is to take place, each Web page connected to the URL address(es) being a source of unstructured digitized data that potentially contains contact information. The output 26 releases an output signal conveying the collected contact information to the workstation 12, for display on a monitor to the system user (**Julien** Paragraph 0031).

“determining, for each match between the identified portions and the information elements, information elements that are related to the document” as a system user provides URL address(es) to the system 20 at workstation 12, in response to a prompt from the system 20, from which the contact information is to be collected. The system 20 thus receives at input 24 an input signal conveying the location, in the form of at least one URL address, where the collection of contact information is to take place, each Web page connected to the URL address(es) being a source of unstructured digitized data that potentially contains contact information. The output 26 releases an output signal conveying the collected contact information to the workstation 12, for display on a monitor to the system user (**Julien** Paragraph 0031).

Julien discloses the elements of claim 5 as noted above but does not explicitly disclose, **“assigning a score to each determined match between one of the identified portions and one of the information elements.”**

However, **Kubota** teaches **“assigning a score to each determined match between one of the identified portions and one of the information elements”** as ranking Search returns a list of documents in the order of the score, which is level of relevance to specified search condition (**Kubota** Col 16, Lines 8-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Kubota's** teaching would have allowed **Julien and Bell** to provide a method for identifying a unique character string contained in an input document which is input into a computer system, said computer system being operable to search comparison documents stored in a storage medium.

Claims 28 and 29 are essentially the same as claim 5 except they set forth the claimed invention as a system and are rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 7 and 8, **Julien** teaches **“match between the identified contact related portions and the contact information elements”** as identification and extraction operations in order to match the extracted information elements with key

words provided by the system user, for example a business name, a phone number, a postal code, etc (**Julien** Paragraph 0075).

Julien teaches the elements of claim 7 and 8 as noted above but does not explicitly teaches “**wherein assigning a score to each match between the identified portions and the information elements, comprises combining the scores assigned to at least two matches between at least two portions and at least one related information element into a combined score for at least one of the at least two matches.**”

However, **Kubota** teaches “**wherein assigning a score to each match between the identified portions and the information elements, comprises combining the scores assigned to at least two matches between at least two portions and at least one related information element into a combined score for at least one of the at least two matches**” as the search term appears more frequently in the document, the score of the document gets higher (**Kubota** Col 16, Lines 16-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Kubota's** teaching would have allowed **Julien and Bell** to provide a method for identifying a unique character string contained in an input document which is input into a computer system, said computer system being operable to search comparison documents stored in a storage medium.

With respect to claim 9, **Julien** teaches “**match between the identified contact related portions and the contact information elements**” as identification and extraction operations in order to match the extracted information elements with key words provided by the system user, for example a business name, a phone number, a postal code, etc (**Julien** Paragraph 0075).

Julien teaches the elements of claim 9 as noted above but does not explicitly teaches “**where assigning a score to each match between the identified portions and the information elements comprises assigning a combined score to at least one of at least two interrelated matches.**”

However, **Kubota** teaches “**where assigning a score to each match between the identified portions and the information elements comprises assigning a combined score to at least one of at least two interrelated matches**” as the search term appears more frequently in the document, the score of the document gets higher (**Kubota** Col 16, Lines 16-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Kubota's** teaching would have allowed **Julien and Bell** to provide a method for identifying a unique character string contained in an input document which is input into a computer system, said computer system being operable to search comparison documents stored in a storage medium.

With respect to claim 10, **Julien** teaches “**contact information elements**” as identification and extraction operations in order to match the extracted information elements with key words provided by the system user, for example a business name, a phone number, a postal code, etc (**Julien** Paragraph 0075).

Julien teaches the elements of claim 10 as noted above but does not explicitly disclose “**ranking the information elements based on the scores assigned to the matches for the information elements.**”

However, **Kubota** teaches “**ranking the information elements based on the scores assigned to the matches for the information elements**” as ranking Search returns a list of documents in the order of the score, which is level of relevance to specified search condition (**Kubota** Col 16, Lines 8-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Kubota's** teaching would have allowed **Julien and Bell** to provide a method for identifying a unique character string contained in an input document which is input into a computer system, said computer system being operable to search comparison documents stored in a storage medium.

Claim 31 is essentially the same as claim 10 except it sets forth the claimed invention as a system and is rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

With respect to claim 13, **Julien** teaches “**forming a display list that includes the contact information elements corresponding to a given number**” as once a list of contact information has been generated for each Web page, the aggregator unit 34 processes the set of lists, removing any redundant contact information and completing, if possible, any partial contact information, for generating a final list containing all of the identified contact information. This final list is returned in the output signal to the system user (**Julien** Paragraph 0061).

Julien teaches the elements of claim 13 as noted above but does not explicitly disclose “**scores having the highest values.**”

However, **Kubota** teaches, “**scores having the highest values**” as figure 15 (**Kubota** Figure 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Kubota’s** teaching would have allowed **Julien and Bell** to provide a method for identifying a unique character string contained in an input document which is input into a computer system, said computer system being operable to search comparison documents stored in a storage medium.

With respect to claim 15, **Julien** teaches “**determining at least one representation of at least one contact information element present in the database; and determining, for each determined representation, if there is at least**

one contact-related portion in the document that matches the determined representation” as the input 24 receives from the workstation 12 an input signal conveying at least one instruction governing the collection of the specific information. The instruction(s) may include the location where the collection is to take place, the nature of the specific information to be collected, a key word based on which the specific information is to be collected, among other possibilities (**Julien** Paragraph 0030). The identification unit is then operative to examine the data contained in each Web page connected to the URL address and to identify therein any information elements relevant to contact information, such as a telephone number, an e-mail address, a postal code, a name of a city, etc (**Julien** Paragraph 0013).

With respect to claim 16, **Julien** teaches **“determining at least one representation of at least one contact information element present in the database comprises selecting at least one contact information element as the at least one determined representation”** as the input 24 receives from the workstation 12 an input signal conveying at least one instruction governing the collection of the specific information. The instruction(s) may include the location where the collection is to take place, the nature of the specific information to be collected, a key word based on which the specific information is to be collected, among other possibilities (**Julien** Paragraph 0030). The identification unit is then operative to examine the data contained in each Web page connected to the URL address and to identify therein any

information elements relevant to contact information, such as a telephone number, an e-mail address, a postal code, a name of a city, etc (**Julien** Paragraph 0013).

With respect to claim 17, **Julien** teaches **“determining, for each determined representation, if there is at least one contact-related portion in the document that matches the determined representation comprises searching the document for instances of the selected contact information element”** as the requirements of each tag within a cluster of contact information may vary. During the aggregation process, each time a tag requirement is exceeded or violated, the clustering stops in one or both directions from the seed tag. In a specific example, the tag requirements are specified with a minimum and maximum possible number of instances and an order (**Julien** Paragraph 0047).

With respect to claim 18, **Julien** teaches **“determining at least one representation of at least one contact information element present in the database comprises generating at least one regular expression from at least one contact information element as the at least one determined representation”** as the concept of “regular expressions” is well known to those skilled in the art and, as such, will not be described in further detail. Different regular expression processing tools, such as OROmatcher (trade-mark), can be used by the identification unit for interpreting

the data of the Web pages in order to identify therein and categorise information elements relevant to the requested specific information (**Julien** Paragraph 0017).

With respect to claim 19, **Julien** teaches **“determining, for each determined representation, if there is at least one contact-related portion in the document that matches the determined representation comprises querying the document using the at least one generated regular expression”** as the concept of "regular expressions" is well known to those skilled in the art and, as such, will not be described in further detail. Different regular expression processing tools, such as OROmatcher (trade-mark), can be used by the identification unit for interpreting the data of the Web pages in order to identify therein and categorise information elements relevant to the requested specific information (**Julien** Paragraph 0017).

With respect to claim 24, **Julien** teaches **“the information retrieval system comprises at least one of: a context monitoring subsystem; an information analysis subsystem; and a contact information display subsystem”** as (**Julien** Figure 1 and 4).

With respect to claim 32-33 **Julien** teaches **“wherein corollary information corresponding to the matched contact information is retrieved from the database and wherein the matched contact information and the corollary information are**

made available to the user” as the input 24 receives from the workstation 12 an input signal conveying at least one instruction governing the collection of the specific information. The instruction(s) may include the location where the collection is to take place, the nature of the specific information to be collected, a key word based on which the specific information is to be collected, among other possibilities (**Julien** Paragraph 0030). The identification unit is then operative to examine the data contained in each Web page connected to the URL address and to identify therein any information elements relevant to contact information, such as a telephone number, an e-mail address, a postal code, a name of a city, etc (**Julien** Paragraph 0013, Figure 1 and 4).

With respect to claim 34, 35 and 38, **Julien** teaches **“the user is provided with an unobtrusive notification of the retrieved information and the notification allows the user to access more information by a single interaction”** as table, of all of the retrieved contact information, where this output signal is transmitted to the system user by display on the monitor of the workstation (**Julien** Paragraph 0015 and Figure 1).

With respect to claim 37, **Julien** teaches, **“wherein the information gathering device is at least one of a workstation, a desktop computer, a laptop computer, a scanner, an audio/video recorder, and a remote station”** as (**Julien** Figure 1 and 4).

With respect to claim 40, **Julien** does not explicitly teaches, “**ranking the contact information prior to displaying.**”

However, **Kubota** teaches “**ranking the contact information prior to displaying**” as the found documents are evaluated and arranged in the order of evaluation. The similarity factor of a document is evaluated in such a manner that the number of appearances of each unique character string in the input sentence is used as weight (**Kubota** Col 17, Lines 59-64 & Figure 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Kubota's** teaching would have allowed **Julien and Bell** to provide a method for identifying a unique character string contained in an input document which is input into a computer system, said computer system being operable to search comparison documents stored in a storage medium.

With respect to claims 41-43, **Julien** teaches “**wherein the current document displayed on the user monitor is authored by the user, retrieved by the user, or presented to the user**” as on the basis of the key word(s) input by the system user, one or more specific Web pages from the plurality of pages returned by the search engine, passing only the URL address(es) for the selected specific Web page(s) to the identification unit of the system (**Julien** Paragraph 0020).

Further, **Bell** teaches utilizing a Web browser 33 or other suitable network search engine, a device user can send a search request 31 for a Web object to a remote resource (not shown) coupled to the network 30 (**Bell** Paragraph 0031).

3. Claims 6, 11, 12, 14, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Benoit Julien** (U.S. PG Pub No. 2002/0129011) in view of **Bell et al.** (U.S. PG Pub 2004/0044785), further in view of **Rie Kubota**. (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,323) as applied to claims 3-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 16-19, 22-24, 26, 28-29, 31-33, 34-37, and 38-43 further in view of **Lamburt et al.** (**Lamburt** hereinafter) (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,241).

With respect to claim 6, **Julien, Bell and Kubota** do not explicitly teach “wherein the determining process, comprises comparing the assigned scores for each match to a threshold score value.”

However, **Lamburt** discloses “comparing the assigned scores for each match to a threshold score value” as the associated score if a zip code match between each existing entry and the update entry is determined; determining if there is at least one associated score greater than a predetermined threshold; and if there is only one existing entry in the subset with an associated score greater than the predetermined threshold (**Lamburt** Col 1 Lines 65-67 & Col 2, Lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because

Lamburt's teachings would have allowed **Julien, Bell and Kubota** to determine equivalents of various entries, assign the scores to the contact information in the profile, and compare the scores to a predetermined threshold, which would have allowed finding the best matching contact information between the requestor and the transcriber.

With respect to claim 11, **Julien** teaches **“forming a display list that includes the contact information elements”** as once a list of contact information has been generated for each Web page, the aggregator unit 34 processes the set of lists, removing any redundant contact information and completing, if possible, any partial contact information, for generating a final list containing all of the identified contact information. This final list is returned in the output signal to the system user (**Julien** Paragraph 0061).

Julien teaches the elements of claim 11 as noted above but does not explicitly disclose **“scores above a defined threshold.”**

However, **Lamburt** discloses **“scores above a defined threshold”** as the associated score if a zip code match between each existing entry and the update entry is determined; determining if there is at least one associated score greater than a predetermined threshold; and if there is only one existing entry in the subset with an associated score greater than the predetermined threshold (**Lamburt** Col 1 Lines 65-67 & Col 2, Lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because

Lamburt's teachings would have allowed **Julien, Bell and Kubota** to determine equivalents of various entries, assign the scores to the contact information in the profile, and compare the scores to a predetermined threshold, which would have allowed finding the best matching contact information between the requestor and the transcriber.

With respect to claim 12, **Julien** teaches “**wherein forming the display list that includes the contact information elements comprises limiting the display list to at most n contact information elements having the highest values**” as the requirements of each tag within a cluster of contact information may vary. During the aggregation process, each time a tag requirement is exceeded or violated, the clustering stops in one or both directions from the seed tag. In a specific example, the tag requirements are specified with a minimum and maximum possible number of instances and an order (**Julien** Paragraph 0047).

Julien teaches the elements of claim 12 as noted above but does not explicitly teach, “**scores above the defined threshold.**”

However, **Lamburt** discloses “**scores above a defined threshold**” as the associated score if a zip code match between each existing entry and the update entry is determined; determining if there is at least one associated score greater than a predetermined threshold; and if there is only one existing entry in the subset with an associated score greater than the predetermined threshold (**Lamburt** Col 1 Lines 65-67 & Col 2, Lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Lamburt's** teachings would have allowed **Julien, Bell and Kubota** to determine equivalents of various entries, assign the scores to the contact information in the profile, and compare the scores to a predetermined threshold, which would have allowed finding the best matching contact information between the requestor and the transcriber.

With respect to claim 14, **Julien** teaches, “**displaying the display list on the monitor**” as (**Julien** Figure 1 and 4).

With respect to claim 27, **Julien, Bell and Kubota** do not explicitly teach “**the system of claim 26, wherein the context monitoring subsystem recognizes the postal address by recognizing a postal code and stores in a memory the recognized postal code and a predetermined amount of data that precedes the postal code.**”

However, **Lamburt** discloses “**the system of claim 26, wherein the context monitoring subsystem recognizes the postal address by recognizing a postal code and stores in a memory the recognized postal code and a predetermined amount of data that precedes the postal code**” as the search is being performed for entries in the existing database which match zip code and the different components of

the name field (**Lamburt** Col 42, Lines 52-54). Examiner interprets the different components of the name field as amount of data that precedes the postal code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Lamburt's** teachings would have allowed **Julien, Bell and Kubota** to determine equivalents of various entries, assign the scores to the contact information in the profile, and compare the scores to a predetermined threshold, which would have allowed finding the best matching contact information between the requestor and the transcriber.

4. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Benoit Julien** (U.S. PG Pub No. 2002/0129011) in view of **Bell et al.** (U.S. PG Pub 2004/0044785), further in view of **Rie Kubota**. (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,323) as applied to claims 3-5, 7-10, 13, 15, 16-19, 22-24, 26, 28-29, 31-33, 34-37, and 38-43, further in view of **Othmer et al.** (**Othmer** hereinafter) (U.S. PG PUB No. 2004/0064317).

With respect to claim 30, **Julien, Bell and Kubota** do not explicitly teach “**the information analysis subsystem assigns a partial score to at least one matched one of the personal name, the organization name, the position title, the address, the network location, the email address and the at least one telephone number that partially matches at least one contact information element stored in the database.**”

However, **Othmer** teaches “**the information analysis subsystem assigns a partial score to at least one matched one of the personal name, the organization name, the position title, the address, the network location, the email address and the at least one telephone number that partially matches at least one contact information element stored in the database**” as a transcriber profile may match half the elements required by a transcription preferences associated with the transcription request. For each matched element, the transcriber may receive a positive sub-score. For each non-matched element, the transcriber may receive no sub-score. In another embodiment, the non-matched element may earn the transcriber a negative sub-score (**Othmer** Paragraph 0056).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Othmer's** teachings would have allowed **Julien, Bell and Kubota** to provide enough results to be displayed on the list by scoring at least partially matched elements.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/16/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In these arguments applicant relies on the amended claims and not the original ones.

Applicant argues that Julien does not teach "proactively extracting" and says that proactively is extracting is performed by a machine and not by a user.

In response to the preceding arguments examiner respectfully submits that Julien teaches “proactively extracting” as the processing unit extracts the identified information elements from each source of unstructured digitized data where information elements relevant to the specific information have been identified, and processes the extracted information elements for generating an output signal containing the specific information. The system analyzes the contents of each source of unstructured digitized data and automatically extracts therefrom the requested specific information. Secondly, the specific information collected by the system is the most up-to-date information available from the particular source(s) of unstructured digitized data (**Julien** Paragraphs 0008-0009).

Therefore these lines teach the proactive extraction because the extraction is being performed by the machine instead of a user. Examiner agrees with the applicant that the user has to input a URL initially to find the document but the user himself is not identifying/extracting the contact information from the document. The identification unit is examining the data contained in each Web page connected to the URL address and is automatically identifying any information elements relevant to contact information, such as a telephone number, an e-mail address, a postal code, a name of a city, etc.

Even in the applicant invention the user has to open/retrieve a document before it's being currently viewed by the user. If the claims taught that the document being currently viewed by a user is not opened/retrieved by a user and was somehow automatically opened for a view then the invention would be different from prior art.

Since the extraction of elements is being performed by machine instead of user, therefore examiner believes that the Julien teaches proactive extraction.

Julien teaches the proactive extraction from the documents but does not teach the extraction from currently viewed documents. Julien teaches "monitoring a document currently being displayed" as if the device user is viewing a restaurant's Web page, and if the device user has previously registered an address book application with hypertext extraction software residing on the user's device, the user can indicate or command, at the user's option, that a displayed restaurant address be stored in the user's address book application (**Bell Paragraph 0023**). Web browser window 100 can be made up of a number of frames. For example, one frame can be a browser menu 102 the details of which are not particularly relevant to embodiments of the present invention. Another frame (not shown) could be an advertisement. Another frame (not shown) could include contact information, such as a phone number, address, etc. Another frame (not shown) could be a menu (separate from browser menu 102) that is associated with a Web page currently being displayed (**Bell Paragraph 0062**).

Examiner agrees that user is sending commands when the elements have to be extracted but examiner is combining this reference to teach the extraction of elements from a document being currently displayed.

Further, Kubota reference is being combined to teach the scoring of elements. Therefore the proactive extraction of Julien combined with Bell and Kubota's teachings teach the invention as a whole.

Claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation during examination and limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim (See M.P.E.P. 2111 [R-I]).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usmaan Saeed whose telephone number is (571)272-4046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571)272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Usmaan Saeed
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2166

Hosain Alam
Supervisory Patent Examiner

US
November 13, 2008

/Hosain T Alam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166